



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WHAT IS NATIONALITY?

BY TULLY C. KNOLES, A. M.

In text books, general historical works, magazine articles, and in addresses before historical societies and other learned bodies the term "Nationality" is often met, and it is used with various contents.

With this same heading there is an illuminating article in the "Unpopular Review," January-March, 1916, by Preston W. Slosson, lecturer in Columbia University, in which the author sums up an excursion into this field of thought in the following words: "It is clear, then, that no one objective test of nationality will cover all cases. Race, language, religion, physical unity, political government, memories of the past, and a common fund of ideas may contribute to a patriotic sentiment, but they should never be confused with it."

In the Presidential Address before the American Historical Society at the December, 1915 meeting, our own honored Dr. Henry Morse Stephens on the subject "History and Nationality" made reference to an article published by him in the "Contemporary Review," London, 1887, on "Modern Historians and Their Influence Upon Small Nationalities." Dr. Stephens paid tribute to the historians of the nineteenth century who not only recorded historical facts but who so wrote as to lead the people for whom they wrote to appreciate the possibility of national unity, and the term nationality is used in this connection.

There is no question but that originally the word nation meant a group of men and women more or less closely related through intermarriage who had acquiesced or had coöperated in the establishment of a government which was more or less truly a structural expression of their psychology; and wherever these governments over such groups have persisted for a lengthened term there has been a reaction not only from the group mind to the form of government, but the government in its turn has reacted upon the group mind, as for instance in Japan, an eclectic system of government is coming to be a national expression, but by the broadest stretch of conventionality it could not be called an expression of nationality.

The waves of Celtic and Teutonic invasions hurled themselves across Europe and into the Roman Empire. Out of the confusion came the eastern and western empires, and within them came the beginnings of the modern European nations, kindreds, and the march system played its part in laying the foundations of this national system. Without any question for hundreds of years the nation and the nationality were one.

But with the rise of the European state system, the embodiment of which was not the nation, but the prince, when peoples in their homogeneity were not considered as necessary parts of the state, where neither physiography nor ethnology was an essential study for the builder of governmental structures, the content of the word nation underwent a great change, and no longer was blood relationship connoted in the term. It took new content from the new state system.

President Lowell says, "The spirit of the French Revolution was in its essence humanitarian. It disregarded the narrow distinctions of race and country, proclaimed the universal brotherhood of man, and offered to all the world the blessings of its creed. Yet the political movements to which it gave rise have brought about an increase of race feeling so great that people of different blood can no longer live peaceably together under the same government, and the various branches of a race are unhappy until they are covered by a single flag. Race, in other words, has become a recognized basis of nationality; and this has produced in Europe two new states, and loosened the bonds of two old ones. Within a generation ties of blood have united Italy and Germany, while England has debated a plan for a partial separation between Saxons and Celts, and Austria has become very seriously disintegrated under the strain of racial antipathies."

Napoleon, instead of being the "child of the Revolution," was its "Nemesis," and in the Preface to Vol. XI of the Cambridge Modern History series, we read, "The effects produced by the French Revolution and the reign of the First Napoleon in the domain of political ideas, especially in regard to nations of self government and the spirit of nationality, were indeed immense and enduring." But Metternich dominated the Congress of Vienna and a recrudescence of the old European "state system" was the inevitable result.

The reaction set in in 1848, and for about a quarter of a century we have what the historians almost invariably call the period of the "rise of nationalities," meaning the growth of a new "state system" on a national basis.

Hazen says, "the unification of Germany was completed in the Franco-German war. The unification, however, was no by-product of a war, no astounding improvisation of a genius in politics and diplomacy. The foundations had been laid before, and the superstructure had been slowly and painfully built up. Many forces had been coöperating, as we have seen, and had at last converged toward this triumphant issue. Most effective of all was the passion for nationality, which gave the nineteenth century such elevation of emotion everywhere."

A study of the structure of the German Empire, however, reveals two difficulties. In the first place it is a unit of units of na-

tionality, and in the second place it does not begin to cover what may with propriety be called German nationality.

There is another meaning often given to the term "nationality,"—the legitimate and natural outcome of family, tribal, and racial organization. This definition would be received without question did we have many instances of such development. Of the modern European nations, France is most typical. Many families and tribes entered into the composition of the French people: Celts, Romans, Teutons in large numbers; but amalgamation, though of course not perfect, had its influence, and as pointed out by Dr. Stephens, Henri Martin declares "that the *'esprit gaulois'* illustrates the fact that the French national character persisted through the settlement of German Franks and Scandinavians."

Certainly France from the time of the Battle of Bouvines began to have a consciousness of self which expressed itself in a national structure of government and in national patriotism: it was a consciousness of self as a nationality. This was not lost even during the iconoclastic days of the Revolution, and in the passion for the "Rights of Man."

In only lesser degrees may one speak of England and Spain as illustrations of the growth of nationality out of the amalgamation of more or less closely related groups.

The case of Belgium is peculiarly interesting and peculiarly illuminating at this point; although cut into two divisions, Flemings and Walloons, no one could for a moment hesitate to speak of a strong national bond, a determined sense of national honor, and a superb national patriotism, a nationalism, but it would be difficult to speak accurately of a Belgian nationality until there has been a breaking down of the wall of partition between the kindreds. Switzerland is another case, as pointed out by President Lowell, this little country may be called the "ethnological as well as the geographical center of Europe, the place where the rivers take their rise, and the races meet together."

These remarkable hill people, freedom loving, industrious, thus sharply divided in blood and in speech, are also sharply divided in religion, and yet curiously enough are nationalistic to a degree. Although of necessity the government is not highly centralized, and although the situation is somewhat modified by the fact that Switzerland is a neutral state, the Swiss are exceedingly patriotic, their passion is for nationalism, an appreciation of the fact of political national freedom, and an appreciation of the blessings of self government; it is very noticeable that the local forms of government are wisely limited by a rather conservative Federal Council. Again there is very little immigration and the people are decidedly stationary, and it is not likely that the present divisions will be very seriously changed for many years, if at all.

Quite the reverse from that of Switzerland in many ways is the status of unhappy Poland. The history of patriotism cannot be written without having the Poles in mind; their story comes to us in poetry and in music, and the virility of the nationality is nowhere better illustrated than by the fact that in spite of three partitions, and that which has aptly been called the murder of Poland, the sense of nationality is as strong today as ever. The attempts of Prussia, Russia, and Austria to denationalize Poland succeeded; the recent declaration to erect the Kingdom of Poland is an admission that the Pole in his home life and emotional life has kept the fountains of his political thought life Polish.

One of the strange chapters of human history is that of the persistent nationality of the Jew. Through dispersion and other persecutions, national political state life has been denied him. Yet he is found everywhere, in all nations; persecuted in most places, pampered in none. There is no advancing nation which has not had the advantage of his business acumen; there have been no great wars fought since the Crusades which he has not, in part, financed; he is found in all strata of society; he is in industry, in agriculture, in commerce; in all of the arts and professions; in politics and in statesmanship; every nation which deals at all fairly with him as an individual knows his value as a citizen and as a soldier, and yet he seldom forgets that he is a Jew; as a rule he marries within the narrow group of his own nationality.

Other illustrations might be given of the persistence of types of nationalities after political exigencies have robbed the people of their state life, but enough has been said to indicate that instead of the nineteenth century being the century of the growth of nationality it was the century of the growth of nationalism.

Too much, possibly, cannot be said of the effect of historical writers upon the change in the national system. It was great and far reaching. But Treitschke, a Saxon of Czech descent, had a dream of national unity, and he and his school well performed the task of arousing in the Prussians the passion for unifying the German speaking peoples; but Bismarck the statesman saw the futility of the attempt to incorporate Austria with its numerous nationalities into a great German state; the dream of Treitschke has not yet been realized,—it probably never will be realized.

In recent years we have heard much of Pan-Slavism,—this is only another indication of a by-product of the growth of a passion for national state organization to be based upon blood relationship, even though that organization should call for the complete rearrangement of historic institutions and governments.

In the development of the European states as nations the historian has done his part; but his part was not all. There is a "dollar diplomacy" where the dollar is not the coin current; and the at-

tempt to force economic growth for the profit of the nation, and to produce local cultural units, and to make these seem to be the expression of nationality, are activities far reaching in their results, and perhaps in the subtlety of their application more potent in producing national patriotism.

Each European power in the present conflict is fighting for a national existence, and each sees the good of humanity in its individual success.

To contend for the mere definition of words is not the object of this paper. Definitions are never final until words are no longer used, or when thinkers are no longer active; but two great thoughts are pushed into the forefront by the discussion.

(1) The nineteenth century was the century of the expansion of nations usually upon the basis of nationality, though not wholly so, even in the Old World; and the inevitable result of that expansion was a world war. To quote Dr. Stephens again, "National patriotism became the national creed. It filtered through the entire educational system of modern states. However excellent patriotism may be in itself, it has had some startling effects when based upon nationalist histories. The idea of a common Christianity binding all Christian peoples together in one religion has disappeared: the belief in the brotherhood of man has no chance. . . . Hymns of hate are the inevitable outcome of national patriotism based upon national histories. Family blood feuds, the vendettas of the Corsicans and the Kentucky mountaineers are considered proofs of a backward civilization, but national hatreds are encouraged as manifestations of national patriotism."

(2) The United States, in its evolution thus far, has not been developed as the European states have been. The stage was set for the building of a New England, a New France, a New Spain, a New Netherlands, a New Sweden. Each of the old world powers desired to plant its own people, institutions of society and government, and the character of the peoples would have undergone very slight change; and the old world system would have produced old world problems; but it was not so to be with any of them save with Spain; the conditions of Spanish life led to the search for bullion, New Spain became a fact, but revolutions came, and Spanish-America is more a force to be reckoned with in the twentieth century than in the nineteenth.

The forces of French life in the seventeenth century were centrifugal; the forces of English life in the same century were centrifugal; instead of the unity of religion and society, and the perfection of absolutism which France knew, England was painfully conscious of schisms, lines of social cleavage and the struggle between absolutism and democracy, and out of these conditions America set out on a period of growth dominated by England; and when the

star of the British Empire was in the ascendancy France as a positive force was withdrawn.

The gifted President of the University of California has said that the American Revolution was like a great plow running from the Atlantic ocean to the Mississippi river and return, throwing the loyalists and foreigners to the north and south; and into the furrow ran the stream of European migration, not tribal, but often family and most frequently individual in its character, and there was begun that long procession of immigrants at first almost entirely from the British Empire, and then in increasing numbers from the other northern European nations, and more recently from southern and eastern Europe, until by the report of the Thirteenth Census of the United States 35.2% of the population of the country was either foreign born or of foreign parentage. This foreign white stock is distributed as follows by country of origin—Germany 25.7; Ireland 14.0; England 7.2; Scotland 2.0; Wales .8; Canada 8.6; Russia and Finland 8.5; Austria 6.2; Hungary 2.2; Sweden 4.2; Norway 3.0; Denmark 1.2; Italy 6.5; all others 9.9.

In the decade 1900-1910 persons having Ireland and Wales as countries of origin actually decreased, while all other countries showed an increase in our population from 4%, in the case of Germany, to 188.3% in the case of Italy, 204.7% in the case of Russia and Finland, and 220.5% in the case of Hungary.

There are no statistics available showing directly the number of intermarriages between persons born in the several foreign countries and native Americans, but there are in our country 5,981,526 children of such marriages, one for every 15 of the entire population.

In this same decade there was an increase of 11.5% in the number of those whose parents were both foreigners, but of different nationalities, in number 1,177,092, or one in seventy.

With the exception of the Old South every area of the United States is directly affected by this infusion of new blood, and the urban population of the South is feeling the effect.

These figures, let me remind you again, are only for white stock—they take no account of negroes and orientals who have acquired citizenship by birth. And according to a late report from the County Board of Health in Los Angeles County one-fourth of all the births in the rural sections of that county were of Japanese.

Thus it is clear that during the entire history of our land we have been reversing the European method of nation building. Confessedly Europe has sought and produced types, and these types, more or less true to their nature, have produced nations based either upon nationalism or nationality. Dr. B. I. Wheeler speaks of the coming "*Genus Homo Americanus*," and Israel Zangwill speaks of the "melting pot," as if the elements would some day be fused into the "American"; rather we have been breaknig down types,—the

American is not, he is becoming, and by the same tokens he will always be becoming.

In addition to this, which even a casual examination of the country of origin of our population, makes evident, there is the further fact that our people, unlike the inhabitants of Switzerland, are moving from place to place, and naturalization is national and not local. No tariff walls between the states and no inter-state immigration laws tend to localize population, and the natural tendency of the immigrants to dwell near their own kind, aided to a great degree by urban and industrial conditions, is being overcome by the spirit of freedom here engendered, by the school system, by social workers, and above all by the passion to become American rapidly developed in the children of the first, and more in the second generation.

In the County of Los Angeles during a series of investigations conducted by one of my classes it was found that 1400 persons secured marriage licenses during a certain period: 350 of them were native Californians, including a large number of Mexicans, and 1050 were from every state in the Union and from twenty-three foreign countries.

Mrs. Bertha Hirsch-Baruch, a prominent Jewish social worker, told me that the Jewish leaders here in America were confronted by the very serious problem of the defection of their youth. That which oppression, persecution, and attempted extermination has not been able to accomplish in other countries is being here successfully done, not by design or especially by desire, but by the very freedom from interference which the nationality has sought for its perpetuity, and in an increasing degree Jewish blood is being mingled with blood otherwise antagonistic.

Stanislaus Burek, a descendent of the old Polish kings, says that the Pole who clings to his nationality under political denationalization is losing it rapidly in migration to America and in intermarriage with other peoples here.

During the past two years the "hyphen" has been receiving consideration; and there are indications that assimilation has not been accomplished by undirected efforts as rapidly as necessary. But the schools are grappling with the problem and in some great industrial cities co-operation between the school systems and the great captains of industry is sought to make it not only possible, but necessary for the foreigner to become Americanized.

Immigration is now almost entirely due to attractive forces, and we cannot look for the development of blood relationship for many generations, if at all. And until that time comes there will be no nationality in the United States; and from a world-viewpoint, this development of a great nation during the nineteenth century on a basis diametrically opposite to that attributed to Europe by the



most of her historians is an experiment which must utterly fail, because it violates the essential principles of national life, or it must succeed because it represents the next word in the evolution of national institutions, namely, comparative freedom of movement into, within or from the country, absolute freedom in the choice of naturalization, a real democracy based not on likeness, but on unlikeness. If Goethe's statement, "Above the nations is humanity," is to be anything more than a phrase, perhaps the American intermediate stage points out the way to government "to, for, and by all of the people."

To quote from Slosson: "The popular will is nationality. . . . America is a nation of those who willed to be Americans." With the second statement we heartily agree. Again he says: "If we wished to determine the nationality of an Alsatian . . . I think we should give the man himself a gun and ask him which country he would rather fight for, France or Germany? When he answers you, you will have solved the problem of his nationality." With this we cannot agree; were a similar test made in our own country, men from every race, color, nation, condition and nationality would respond for this nation, but their nationality would not be changed by their will.

Drawn thus from all the world, of every blood, here are men and women who know this nation, who love these institutions, who so appreciate the blessings of a government in which they may have a voice that they are willing to forget all other political ties and submerge the results of hereditary influence into a new nationalism, —these are Americans, irrespective of their nationality.